Interview Summary	10/018,846	KATO ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Daniel Tekle	2621
All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):		
(1) <u>Daniel Tekle</u> .	(3) Marsha D. Bar	irs-Harold
(2) Thomas Presson	(4)	
Date of Interview: 10/25/97		
Type: a)☐ Telephonic b)☐ Video Conference c)☐ Personal [copy given to: 1)☐ applicant 2)☐ applicant's representative]		
Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes If Yes, brief description:	e) Li No.	
Claim(s) discussed: 12		
Identification of prior art discussed: OKado et al.		
Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g)□ was not reached. h)□	N/A.
Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: An agreement was made to consider the proposed (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)		
THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.		
	Marsha D Bar Marsha D. Bank Supervisory Paten TECHNOLOGY CEI	s-harold Ut examiner
Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.	Examiner's sig	nature, if required

Application No.

Applicant(s)